

ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY EDUCATION AMENDMENTS 1059

ments, and the fact that the purposes of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act cannot be achieved unless space and facilities keep pace with the program. Good teachers will continue to migrate to modern facilities in the suburbs as long as the slum school buildings, are overcrowded, unsafe, dimly-lit, evil-smelling, obsolete structures without space or equipment for creative teaching.

We urge Congress to provide funds for school construction without further delay. We cannot subscribe to the premise that such a proposal is in conflict with the nation's defense needs. The cost of military defense, highway construction, exploration of outer space and stimulation of industrial development should not be borne by children of this nation.

In conclusion may I say that the objective of NEA is to assist the Congress in improving the educational opportunities for all of our nation's children. But to achieve this objective, we believe that local and state control of education must be strengthened.

Thank you.

NATIONAL EDUCATION ASSOCIATION,
Washington, D.C., May 3, 1966.

HON. CARL PERKINS,
Chairman, General Subcommittee on Education,
Rayburn House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN PERKINS: We are concerned that the proposed amendments to Title II of P.L. 89-10, Sec. 203, although related to library resources would create serious administrative problems if made applicable to textbooks and instructional materials. Inclusion of these amendments tends to over-emphasize the library purpose of the Title. We continue to believe the textbook and instructional materials provision of this Title is of equal, if not more, value to children.

We support the increased funds for state and local administration of Title II. We see no reason, however, to amend the Act, other than for increased administration funds, because of problems not inherent in the Act itself, but rather created by faulty guidelines.

In his testimony before your subcommittee, speaking officially for the National Education Association Dr. Adron Doran voiced our opposition to the proposed amendment to the Cooperative Research Act which would include profit-making agencies under the benefits of the Act.

This proposal provides that profit-making agencies may contract with the U.S. Office of Education for the training of educational research personnel. As our official testimony states, we see no necessity to further break the pattern of confining federal grants and contracts between the Office of Education and the non-profit public and private institutions, organizations, and agencies. There is no evidence, as we see the situation, that the non-profit public and private institutions are not equal to the task of educating people in the field of research, if given the opportunity and necessary financing.

We supported the original cooperative research act, and subsequent amendments, primarily because it provided opportunity to strengthen the programs of higher educational institutions. We fear that including profit-making agencies in the Act for the purpose of training personnel will weaken the non-profit institutions in several ways.

First, the training of educational research personnel should properly be carried on in the same institution which trains other educational personnel, such as teachers, administrators, and other educational supporting services personnel. The interaction of the disciplines which comprise the educational effort should be strengthened, rather than dissipated through assigning the research training function to a completely separate agency.

The Cooperative Research Act was enacted for the purpose of strengthening the educational research function of higher education institutions. It was contemplated that educational research be done in the field, not be the USOE itself. If this premise still stands, as we insist it must, then it is not necessary for the USOE to train research personnel.

If the purpose of the amendment is merely to make it possible for USOE to contract for training of key punch operators, and other sub-professional computer specialists, then such provision should be made in the administrative budget of the USOE, not by an amendment to the cooperative research act.